



**DRAFT**



**FAMILIES AND EDUCATION LEVY  
LEVY OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE  
Tuesday, March 13, 2012**

**MINUTES**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Tim Burgess, Elise Chayet, Michael DeBell, Lucy Gaskill-Gaddis, Cristina Gonzalez, Sheeba Jacob, Kevin Washington, Greg Wong

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Mohamed Adan (Youth Commission), Glenn Bafia (SEA), Lori Chisholm (Seattle Parks & Rec), TJ Cosgrove (PHSKC), Ainsley Close (MO), Jerry DeGriek (Mayor's Office), Holly Ferguson (SPS), Betsy Graef (Council Staff), Sonja Griffin (HSD), Robert Jackson (voter) Patricia Lee (City Council Central Staff), Catherine Lester (HSD), Amy Liu (OFE Consultant), Grace McClelland (HSD), Holly Miller (OFE), Erica Mullen (YMCA), Isabel Muñoz-Colón (OFE), Robin Pfohman (PHSKC), Janet Jones Preston (SPS), Sid Sidorowicz (OFE), Kristi Skanderup (MSSP), Kian Vesteinsson (Youth Commission)

Tim Burgess called the meeting to order. Introductions were made. The minutes from February 14, 2012 were approved with two amendments: Cristina Gonzalez and Sandi Everlove need to be added as attendees and add final sentence, "The meeting was adjourned."

Holly Miller started by reviewing the process and results from the Requests for Qualifications (RFQ). H. Miller reminded the group that the focus of the Levy is to help students be college and career ready. H. Miller stated that the RFQ is the first in a two-step process. The second step requires schools in partnership with qualified community-based provider(s) to submit a Request for Investment.

H. Miller explained to the LOC that the purpose of the RFQ process was to identify community-based organizations that have a track record for meeting academic outcomes. The RFQ had three major criteria: (1) organizations have key people with the experience meeting academic outcomes for Levy focus students, (2) that they have a record getting results, and (3) that they frequently use data to inform their work. Holly then went through the different RFQ categories and discussed the number of organizations found technically qualified, nonqualified, and technically noncompliant and therefore disqualified.

Holly Ferguson reminded the LOC members that the district did not have to go through the RFQ process. Team Read, for example, did not have to go through the RFQ process because it is a district-run program. Kevin Washington asked if the RFQ process would be done annually. H. Miller stated that there would be another opportunity for CBOs to apply next year.

Greg Wong asked if the RFQ review process was blind or if reviewers knew the names of the applicants. H. Miller stated that reviewers did know the names of the organizations applying. Michael DeBell asked if CBOs were required to look at data on a daily or weekly basis. H. Miller confirmed that the minimum bar was that organizations had to look at data weekly and use data to inform their work. G. Wong asked if there were organizations that did not have relationships with the schools already and didn't have access to the data. H. Miller stated that she believes most of the organizations had relationships with schools; they just didn't track academic outcomes for their students. Kian Vesteinsson asked if organizations that were noncompliant were told why they were noncompliant. H. Miller stated that the organizations found noncompliant were contacted and were told why. Sheeba

Jacob asked if CBOs that attended the summer workshops led by OFE had higher approval ratings than those that did not. H. Miller stated that OFE has not done that analysis but she believes that is the case.

T. Burgess asked if organizations not qualified through the RFQ process could get funded through performance pay. H. Miller stated that performance pay is typically reinvested back into the program to improve outcomes. Technically speaking, performance pay can be used to fund non-qualified CBOs. Elise Chayet asked if there were issues other than data that might have disqualified one organization and not another. H. Miller stated that each RFQ was different and organizations brought different expertise so it is hard to isolate overarching issues. Sid Sidorowicz stated that organizations tended to get qualified for areas where they had previous experience. Lucy Gaskill-Gaddis asked if there was any other issue that cut across the board with the RFQs. H. Miller mentioned that the health organizations did present data on how many students they served but did not link it to academic outcomes.

K. Washington asked if SPS has guidelines on who can work with schools. Michael DeBell stated that the school district just passed new policies regarding schools partnering with CBOs. However, M. DeBell stated that “guidelines” imply that there are procedures and that is not what the policies do. H. Ferguson stated that Courtney Cameron is working on the procedures for partnering with community-based organizations. This process will help both Levy and non-Levy schools. She stated that Seattle Public Schools is also working on streamlining data-sharing agreements in order to address FERPA issues. K. Washington asked if Courtney is responsible for working on the data-sharing agreements. H. Ferguson stated that Courtney is the lead on the data-sharing piece.

E. Chayet asked if OFE had concerns that no health providers were qualified, even though health is an important piece for elementary schools. TJ stated that Elementary Health RFIs are separate from the RFQ process. TJ wasn’t sure if the providers found it difficult to speak to elementary data because they are only in middle and high schools right now. Jerry DeGriek mentioned too that the elementary investment will be phased-in over the next two years. So there will be other opportunities for health providers to become a qualified provider.

Isabel Munoz-Colon described the Request for Investment (RFI) process that started at the beginning of the month. H. Miller mentioned that the school RFIs are modeled after the successful approach used with middle schools in the current Levy. This partnership between the schools and OFE laid the groundwork for the RFIs now underway for elementary and high schools.

J. DeGriek noted the award of five points for community partnerships in the rating criteria. He asked if this was the only place where partnerships are recognized in the RFI rating. Community partnerships are an important part of the new Levy and should be emphasized. I. Munoz-Colon responded that the school management plans would need to address the role of partners in achieving results. H. Miller added that schools would have to address the needs of diverse student populations and that would require community involvement. J. DeGriek reiterated the need to reinforce partnerships for all schools.

S. Jacob asked how OFE would address the capacity at the school level to effectively use data. H. Miller responded that the test for schools is to analyze data and appropriately respond to what it tells the school staff about students and their needs. T. Burgess asked what would happen if a school puts together a proposal but the plan isn’t strong. Does that mean not all schools would get funded? H. Miller answered that OFE is now providing technical support to schools, but not all proposals would necessarily get funded. Schools could reapply the next year with a stronger proposal. T. Burgess responded that schools who do not successfully apply should receive support from SPS and the Seattle Education Association to improve their plan for a subsequent year. H. Ferguson added that SPS will continue to work with OFE to improve plans. M. DeBell pointed out that the RFI process reinforces the importance of leadership at the school level to making improvements.

K. Washington said that this process could open doors for collaborative funding of school improvements. H. Ferguson agreed, adding that the RFI process could create interesting grant

opportunities. H. Miller pointed out that the Levy also makes significant investments in pre-school. RFIs are being released for those as well. T. Burgess added that the Human Services Department is bringing additional resources to the pre-school investments.

L. Gaskill-Gaddis noted that there are more schools applying than funding allows for. This sets up an interesting situation. T. Burgess stated that it was the City Council's intent to make the process fair, equitable, and objective. He believes the process has met those goals. L. Gaskill-Gaddis asked who would be on the RFI review panels. I. Munoz-Colon responded that those are still being put together.

Glenn Bafia noted that the State of Washington hasn't funded WaKIDS appropriately and OFE was making that a requirement. I. Munoz-Colon responded that the city is working with the Department of Early Learning and schools to ensure funding is available. H. Miller added that there are some questions about the validity of the WaKIDS data at this time as well.

M. DeBell said that SPS has adopted the Creative Approach Schools policy and procedure. The process is just started, and though it is probably too late for this round of RFIs, he asked if OFE would consider these schools in the next round. H. Miller responded OFE would consider them if they represented the schools eligible for Levy investments. M. DeBell replied that SPS and OFE might have to better align criteria. J. DeGriek asked if the Creative schools are intended for the 2013-14 school year. G. Bafia agreed that is the intended start, but that some elements might be approved for the 2012-13 school year. T. Burgess added that the Legislature has approved innovative collaborations between schools and the state's colleges. This represents another opportunity. H. Ferguson concluded that there will probably not be any overlap between the Creative schools and the Levy priority schools at this time.

The meeting was adjourned.